DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 453 IR 051 704

AUTHOR	Vidor, David L.; Futas, Elizabeth
TITLE	Collection Development in Professional School Collections.
INSTITUTION	Emory Univ., Atlanta, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY	Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	1 May 86
GRANT	CLR-791-F
NOTE	50p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Libraries; Business Administration Education; Higher Education; *Library Collection Development; *Library Collections; *Library Material Selection; Library Research; Library Statistics; *Professional Education; Questionnaires; *User Needs (Information)
IDENTIFIERS	*Emory University GA

ABSTRACT

An important component of a library's collection management activities should be a measure of the effectiveness of the selection process. Effective selection should be a reflection of titles chosen compared to titles available as well as patron use of the material selected. To evaluate the collection development activities for the School of Business Administration, Emory University, graduates of 1977 and 1983 were surveyed to determine the business journals read by each group as students and as professionals. Additional questions solicited the survey participants' background, use of libraries and use of materials. Study results indicate that: (1) Emory University business graduate students are more satisfied with the items acquired by the use of approval plans and recommendations of subject specialists than by use of the "model" method; (2) the reading interests of students and graduates of a professional education program are more practical or work-oriented and less academic or scholarly; and (3) professional business education, and therefore business collection development, might be better served with more emphasis on the value of information and how to obtain it. Statistical data presented in tabular form and the survey instrument are appended. References are also provided. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276453

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT IN PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL COLLECTIONS

BY

DAVID L. VIDOR

AND

ELIZABETH FUTAS

Council on Library Resources
Faculty/Librarian Cooperative Research Grant
CLR 791-F

May 1, 1986

IR051704

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
David L. Vidor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction..... 1

Academic Materials 5

Professional Materials.....10

Survey Results.....16

Conclusion.....26

Appendix A.....32

Appendix B.....33

Appendix C.....34

Appendix D.....35

Appendix E.....36

Appendix F.....37

Appendix G.....38

Appendix H.....39

Appendix I.....41

Appendix J.....43

Works Consulted.....47

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT IN PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL COLLECTIONS

INTRODUCTION

An important component of a library's collection management activities should be a measure of the effectiveness of the selection process. Effective selection should be a reflection of titles chosen compared to titles available as well as patron use of the material selected.

Since a professional school graduates practitioners in its discipline, its library collection, the authors assume, should be dichotomous. The collection should contain both traditional academic material and the contemporary practical literature of the profession.

An evaluation of the collection development activities for the School of Business Administration, Emory University, was conducted for the years 1977 and 1983. The benchmark for the more traditional academic reading was the publication Recent Additions to Baker Library published by the Harvard Business School. The "ideal" contemporary, practical reading list comprised those books reviewed in business journals most often read by students and professionals. These journals were identified in a survey of the Master of Business Administration graduates of 1977 and 1983. Since the ultimate purpose of collection development is patron use, a sample of the titles acquired by Emory University from these two lists was examined to determine how many items had circulated.

Originally a survey of Emory University MBA graduates of 1977 and 1983 was designed only to determine the business journals read by each group as students and now as professionals. The scope of the survey was broadened when additional questions concerning respondents' background, use of libraries, and use of materials were added.

The years 1977 and 1983 were deliberately chosen because the responsibility for selection, approval plans in use, and fiscal responsibility for library selections had changed between these two years. In 1977, the faculty members of the School of Business Administration were responsible for selecting library materials in the fields of business and economics with payment applied to a line in the Business School Dean's budget. In 1977, the library used only an approval plan for university press books. By 1983, primary responsibility for the selection of materials had been assumed within the Robert W. Woodruff Library by two librarians with Master of Business Administration degrees, and funds were transferred annually from the Business School accounts to the library's accounts. In 1983, the library was participating in approval plans for North American trade publishers from Blackwell North America, British trade publications from B.H. Blackwell, and university press books from Baker and Taylor.

The results of the collection development evaluation for 1977 and 1983 were compared to determine if the recent activities, under the responsibilities of the librarians and utilizing more approval plans, were creating a "better" collection.

To help place the collection development activities and their evaluation in some context, it should be noted that the business collection is integrated into the Robert W. Woodruff Library, which contains materials selected for Emory College, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Business Administration. The School of Business Administration offers degree programs on both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Juniors and seniors in Emory College are permitted to take courses in the School of Business Administration after successfully completing their first two years of undergraduate work. In 1977, seventy people were graduated with a Bachelor of Business Administration degree. The class of 1983 contained 144 Bachelor of Business Administration graduates. The Master of Business Administration is a two-year program which had 40 graduates in 1977 and 104 graduates in 1983. An Executive Master of Business Administration program, an intensive seventeen-month program designed for a mid-level executive with potential for a senior management position, was initiated in January, 1979. In 1983, 25 people were graduated from the Executive Master of Business Administration program. Between 1977 and 1983 the faculty of the School of Business Administration grew from 28 to 47 people. The Robert W. Woodruff Library provides service to students, faculty members, and graduates of the School of Business Administration.

To provide background information, a literature search was conducted in ERIC, LISA, and Library Literature on the topic of collection evaluation in a business school library. Numerous

articles could be found which dealt with either collection development or business collections. Unfortunately, no relevant articles combining both concepts could be identified.

ACADEMIC MATERIALS

New Books in Business and Economics: Recent Additions to Baker Library (currently titled, Recent Additions to Baker Library) provided the basis for a model business collection containing the more academic or scholarly material. Since Harvard's Business School is the top-rated graduate business institution in the country, one could assume that its library collection would be worthy of emulation, and thus an ideal model.

After examining course offerings in Emory University's School of Business Administration 1977-79 catalog to determine locally strong subject fields, the following categories were selected from 1977 issues of New Books in Business and Economics as areas to be compared: Accounting and Control, Corporate and Business Finance, Economic and Social Conditions of the United States, Financial Institutions and Capital Markets, International Business, Management, Marketing, Organizational Behavior, Personnel, and Production Management. In 1977 the Baker Library added 1046 titles in these categories, while Emory University added 442 of the same titles, or 42.26 percent of the titles added to the Baker Library. The acquisition comparisons by individual categories ranged from a low of sixteen percent in Organizational Behavior to a high of 59.26 percent in Economic and Social Conditions of the United States. For a breakdown in each category see Appendix A.

A direct comparison between 1977 and 1983 is not possible because the subject areas in 1983 issues of Recent Additions to Baker Library differed slightly from those used in 1977. The

categories selected for comparison in 1983 were: Accounting and Control, Finance, Human Resource Management, International Business, Management, Marketing, Production and Operation, and United States Economic and Social Conditions. During 1983, 1663 titles were added in these categories to the Baker Library, but only 36.68 percent of that total, or 610 of the same titles, were added at Emory University. Within individual categories, United States Economic and Social Conditions continued to have the highest correlation, with a 51.98 percent duplication of titles. Emory University added only 29.14 percent of the titles on the Baker list in the area of Human Resource Management. Details of the 1983 comparison can be found in Appendix B.

The percentage of new books included on the Baker list and also purchased by Emory University declined 5.58 percent from 1977 to 1983. However, the actual number of books appearing on Harvard's list as well as purchased by Emory University increased 38 percent, from 442 in 1977 to 610 in 1983. In addition, using the average prices for business hardcover books found in the 1985 Bowker Annual, the actual dollar expenditures of Emory University for these titles rose from $7956 in 1977 to $16,909 in 1983, an increase of 112.5 percent. While Emory University added more titles and spent more money in 1983 than in 1977, the percentage of items appearing on the Baker List and purchased by Emory University declined from 42.26 percent to 36.68 percent. It appears that Harvard was adding titles and spending additional monies at a faster rate than was Emory University.

To determine patron use of the books from the Baker Library

list that Emory University owns, a simple random sample of 20 percent was taken. Only those books which circulate or those books with potentially identifiable circulation statistics were included in the working population. Consequently, reference books which do not circulate and government documents which do not retain a circulation record were not included. The circulation system at Emory is not automated in any way, so each item in the sample was physically examined to determine if at least one date due stamp appeared on the circulation record slip glued inside the cover. Of the 70 books comprising the 1977 sample, 55, or 78.6 percent, had circulated at least once, eleven books, or 15.7 percent, had never circulated, and four books, or 5.7 percent, could not be located either on the shelf or in the circulation files. The sample for 1983 contained 84 books, of which 56, or 66.67 percent, had circulated at least once, 25, or 29.76 percent, had never circulated, while three books, or 3.57 percent, could not be located. The survey of business school graduates to be discussed below revealed greater student use of monographic materials in 1977 than in 1983. Also, it must be taken into account that books purchased in 1977 had had six more years in which to circulate.

Based upon the circulation records found in the 1977 sample, there appears to be a longer useful shelf life for academic business books than that which is perceived for the truly academic disciplines within the social sciences. Slightly less than 75 percent of the 1977 academic business books examined had circulated at least once between 1983 and 1985. Researchers in the social sciences have traditionally equated use with citation

analysis. In the 1960's and 1970's, when obsolescence studies were conducted on the literature of the social sciences, researchers proved that the majority of use came in the first four years. The value of items in the 1983 sample should not be determined until 1990 in order to provide the necessary time period before expected obsolescence. Furthermore, the hypothesis of prolonged, useful shelf life for academic books within a profession might be extended to other disciplines with professional literature, with comparisons made between the particular profession and its more general academic counterpart.

An evaluation of the business collection at Emory University by means of a list-checking exercise with Harvard University's Baker Library as the ideal model has been based on the assumption that the better library collection is the larger library collection. When one recognizes that all business schools are not equal, however, one should also recognize that all library collections need not be identical, either.

Harvard's Business School offers a masters degree as well as a doctorate. An undergraduate business degree is not offered. In 1977, Harvard Business School had seven times as many students as Emory's School of Business Administration. Since the library research needs of undergraduates and masters-level students are not as strenuous as the combined research needs of doctoral and masters students, library collections supporting these disparate student bodies should also be different. The Harvard Business School had six times as many faculty members in 1977 as did the School of Business Administration at Emory. Student enrollment

and the number of faculty are only two factors which must be considered when building any academic library collection and should therefore be weighed when a comparison between two collections is made. Unless a minimum acceptable standard for a collection can be established for each particular situation, how can one determine collection building effectiveness?

The generally accepted practice of list-checking as a means of collection evaluation should be questioned because, as demonstrated above, Emory University's student and faculty populations are not equivalent to Harvard's, yet the list-checking procedure assumes comparability if the results are to be meaningful. A more accurate evaluation of the collection could be obtained if a list from a comparably sized school with similar academic programs and a library with appropriate stature would be checked. Unfortunately, in this situation as well as in most cases, the only list which is available to check has been generated by a superior institution. List-checking in collection evaluation will become a valuable technique when one can differentiate quality from quantity, when one can determine what is an appropriately-sized collection for each situation, and when one can check more than one list.

PROFESSIONAL MATERIALS

A survey of Emory University's 1977 and 1983 MBA graduates revealed that as students and professionals they most frequently read the following serials: Barron's, Business Week, Forbes, Fortune, the Harvard Business Review, and the Wall Street Journal. A list of the books which were reviewed in these sources was compiled to serve as a paradigm of professional literature published and reviewed in a particular year. Since this study was interested only in evaluating the business collection, the books reviewed were divided into two categories: business (as determined by the business and economics bibliographer) or non-business. When the reviews were initially examined, Forbes was prematurely excluded from further consideration because a disproportionate number of books reviewed covered non-business subjects. In 1977, these serials reviewed 424 books. Only 40.8 percent of these reviews (173 titles) concerned business books, while 59.2 percent (251 titles) involved non-business topics. Six years later, 423 books were reviewed by these five serials, with 148 (35 percent) business titles and 275 (65 percent) non-business titles. A breakdown of this data by year and by individual serial will be found in Appendix C.

The business book reviews were subsequently examined to determine how many of the books were owned by Emory University. For the business book reviews in 1977, 109 titles or 63 percent were found at Emory, and for those reviewed in 1983 the local holdings rose to 70.9 percent, or 105 books. Looking at each

serial individually, the number of reviewed business books owned ranged from a low of around 53 percent to a high of approximately 91 percent. The serials containing reviews for the highest and lowest percentages of business titles owned changed during this period. In 1977, 90 percent of the business titles reviewed in Business Week were owned by Emory University, compared with only 53.2 percent of the business books reviewed in the Harvard Business Review. Six years later Fortune led the way, with 92.3 percent of its books reviewed appearing in the Emory collection. At the other end of the scale for 1983, only 52.9 percent of the business titles reviewed in Barron's were also owned by Emory. Statistics for each serial and each year can be found in Appendix D. No attempt was made to determine which books, or even how many books, received favorable reviews. Therefore, a high acquisition rate in this study is based on the assumption that the appearance of any review merits the purchase of the book.

Some books were reviewed in more than one of the serials examined. In 1977, fifty titles were reviewed in two, three, or four of the serials examined (no books was reviewed in all five). Thirty-one of these (62 percent) were business titles. These findings are presented in greater detail in Appendix E. When compared with the previously cited 40.8 percent for business book reviews as a proportion of all reviews in 1977, the 62 percent representing the number of business books reviewed in multiple serials is significant. Apparently books receiving reviews in multiple sources are much more likely to be business books than those items reviewed in only one of the serials examined. The

same conclusion can be applied to 1983, when 57.6 percent of the books with multiple reviews were for business books, while only 35 percent of all reviews were for business books.

When statistics concerning the purchase of business books with multiple reviews are compared to statistics for the purchase of business books in general, it appears more likely that books with multiple reviews will be purchased. Of the 31 books receiving multiple reviews in 1977, 23 (74.2 percent) were purchased by Emory, while 16 (84.2 percent) of the 19 such items in 1983 were purchased. For both 1977 and 1983, at least ten percent more of the business books with multiple reviews were purchased than business books in general (74.2 percent vs. 63 percent for 1977; 84.2 percent vs. 70.9 percent in 1983). Appendix F illustrates the data on the purchases of multiple-review books.

Since a majority of the books reviewed in each year were not business books (59.2 percent in 1977 and 65 percent in 1983), an analysis was performed on the non-business books in order to determine the subjects of the books being reviewed. Books that received multiple reviews in the five serials were only counted once to avoid overstating the numbers of reviews within each subject area. Based upon the subject classifications found on records retrieved from searching the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC), the 232 non-business books reviewed in 1977 were assigned a total of 58 different Library of Congress subject areas. The 261 non-business books reviewed in 1983 were assigned to 65 different subject areas. While there were books in numerous subject areas reviewed in both years, there were 85

unique Library of Congress subject areas covered when the subject areas for 1977 and 1983 were consolidated.* The data on non-business book subject areas and acquisitions rates can be found in Appendices G, H, and I.

To find out how many of the business books identified by reviews in these serials and owned by Emory University had circulated, a random sample of 20 percent was taken. Because circulation is related to books and not book reviews, all books were included only once in the working population, thereby eliminating possible multiple sampling of the same book as a result of the occurrence of multiple reviews. Both years, 1977 and 1983, contained 17 books in the sample. All 17 books in the 1983 sample had circulated, while for 1977 only 15 books (88.2 percent) had circulated at least once, one (5.9 percent) had not circulated at all, and the remaining one could not be located. These circulation statistics are in direct contradiction to the circulation statistics for materials which appeared on the Baker list. Unlike academic materials from the Baker list, professional books tend to circulate sooner after acquisition if they are going to circulate at all.

It was assumed that books receiving multiple reviews would have a greater tendency to circulate because more people would have read a review and would therefore be aware of the title's

*It is interesting to note that the acquisitions rate for the non-business books reviewed in the five serials examined is almost identical to the acquisitions rate for the business books. In 1977, 109 of 173 business books (63 percent) were acquired, along with 151 of 232 non-business items (65.1 percent). In 1983, 105 of 148 business titles (70.9 percent) and 186 of 261 nonbusiness titles (71.3 percent) were purchased.

existence. This assumption was not proven in this study. While 88.2 percent of the 1977 business book sample had circulated at least once, only 87 percent (20 of 23) of the business titles owned by Emory and receiving multiple reviews had circulated. A finding consistent with the assumption would have revealed a higher percentage among the multiple-review books than in the general sample. For the 1983 titles the results were identical: all of the 17 titles in the general sample had circulated at least once, as had all 16 of the business titles receiving multiple reviews in the five key business serials. In neither year does the existence of multiple reviews increase the chances that a title will circulate, thus calling into question the requirement in many selection policies that two or more reviews are needed in order to acquire any title.

Circulation statistics reveal a much greater interest in the professional monographic literature than the academic material for both 1977 and 1983. For items appearing in the 1977 lists, ten percent more books in the professional (serial reviews) sample circulated than did books in the academic (Baker list) sample (88.2 percent vs. 78.6 percent). The 1983 comparison is even more dramatic because all items on the professional sample circulated while only 66.67 percent of the Baker list sample circulated.

Since students and professionals frequently read the serials examined in this study, business books reviewed in them should be considered for library acquisition, particularly after the circulation rate for books reviewed in these serials during 1977 was computed at 88.2 percent, with an even higher 1983 rate of

100 percent. However, business bibliographers seriously need to consider the time-effectiveness in using these five sources as selection aids, since business books comprised fifty percent or less of all books reviewed in three of the five serials.

SURVEY RESULTS

As part of the original methodology of the research project, a questionnaire survey was to be sent to Emory University Business School graduate students in the classes of 1977 and 1983 to discover the current reading matter of these former students. In designing the survey instrument, the researchers decided to ask about several other areas of interest to the business school bibliographer. A twelve item questionnaire was sent to Master of Business Administration graduates of the two years (see Appendix J for the entire instrument) with a return rate of 30.77% for 1977 graduates and 38.76% for 1983 graduates (with the latter divided into 40.38% of the two year, full-time MBA's answering and 32% of Executive MBA's answering). The researchers considered this a workable percentage on which to draw conclusions of a significant nature.

A number of background questions were asked in order to obtain a sense of the type of businessperson produced by the University. All of the respondents were in the profit sector of the business community. The two classes demonstrated a real divergence in the types of business they were in. The largest percentage of the 1977 group considered themselves in manufacturing, and the largest percentage of the 1983 group was in financial companies, with almost equivalent numbers in services and manufacturing. The contrast in full-time MBA's was even more striking between 1977 and 1983 when the Executive MBA's (EMBA) were examined separately, because the EMBA's were largely in manufacturing. It appeared for the class of 1983 that a lot

more of the younger graduates were going into financial institutions while more of the EMBA's, who were already established in careers while they were in the program, continued to be employed in the field of manufacturing. This shift in areas of employment reflects the growth in American service and financial areas and the decline of manufacturing, a trend which the business community recognizes, judging by the number of articles in general and business periodicals on the topic.

When graduates were queried about their functions within the organizations they serve, there were discrepancies between both the two years surveyed and the two types of students. A large percentage of 1977 graduates considered themselves managers with a smaller group divided between marketing and financial positions. In 1983, the largest group was split between marketing and financial positions with a distant second group, much further down the scale, in management positions. The difference between the number of 1977 and 1983 graduates of the more traditional two year full-time program in financial positions was even greater in the latter year. When the differences between only EMBA's and all MBA's are examined, the smallest group of EMBA's is in financial positions while the largest group of MBA's is there.

The conclusions drawn about the background portion of the survey only reconfirmed what both the University and the Business School already knew about their graduates and the direction in which the business community was moving. In more recent years, a greater number of positions have tended to be in financial and service occupations rather than in the more traditional

manufacturing areas. Those students entering Executive MBA programs are older and already established in the middle management of their companies, and those companies are more likely to be in the area of manufacturing than in services, financial or otherwise. Not surprisingly, graduates from a number of years ago are more apt to be in positions of management than those who just graduated. The positions and fields of business of the survey respondents assured the researchers that the graduates participating in the survey accurately reflect today's business professionals.

The next group of questions concerned the use of materials offered by the library to the students in the Business School. Again there were differences in the way the questions were answered by the four groups (that is to say, the two groups representing the years, 1977 and 1983; and the two groups representing the types of students, EMBA and MBA). Since the graduates' answers in this section were based upon their memory and recollections, there is less confidence that the answers reflected genuine occurrences and not respondents' attitudes.

The first question asked in this section dealt with the use of the library. The largest number of respondents used the library for a multitude of reasons. The difference in the groups was mainly between the two separate years, 1977 and 1983, rather than between the different types of students, MBA's and EMBA's. The more recent students used the library for writing purposes and for case studies, while the 1977 students used the library equally for writing assignments and reading assignments. It is probably unwise to attribute these differences to the

students themselves as they may be a function of newer methodologies in teaching.

There is a greater discrepancy in the type of literature used by the groups. The largest single difference seems to be that the 1977 group relied more heavily on monographic material while both 1983 groups used mainly periodical literature. Journals were used most frequently (69%) by both 1983 groups, while the 1977 group used both books and journals equally (46.2% each). The largest group in the entire survey, including both years and different types of students, indicated that they used multiple types of material; but the trend still appeared to be toward periodical rather than monographic literature. This may represent a trend in teaching rather than a trend in student use or it could reflect a dramatic increase in the number of periodical subscriptions in the intervening years.*

The third question asked for specific information on journals that were read by students. Again, memory played a part in the answers to this question; six years is a long time to remember what periodicals were read as a student. The most popular journals on a list of fourteen titles provided in the survey were Business Week and Forbes, with Fortune, Harvard Business Review and Barron's running a close second. Among those journals not on the list, the respondents named Advertising Age most often and Time, Value Line, and Wall Street Transcript a close second. Some differences occur between the separate groups of students. The single most

*Between 1/1/78 and 12/31/83 the Woodruff Library added 201 new business and economic journal subscriptions.

cited journal from the 1977 MBA group was the Harvard Business Review, while from the 1983 MBA group, the most cited was Business Week. Among the EMBA group, two journals were cited with equal frequency, Fortune and Forbes. Although every group ranked journals differently, only the 1977 group remembered reading a more scholarly journal. The others, the recent graduates, remembered basically "popular" periodicals. It is hard to determine whether selective memory had more to do with this than actual use. While the 1977 group did not indicate a favorite title when citing journals not included on the list provided, the 1983 MBA's selected Time, Advertising Age, and Wall Street Transcript. The EMBA group added Money and Inc to the list as the journals they remembered most from their student days.

The last question in this section concerned student use of online services. This question was asked to determine any difference in the utilization of library services in a school or work environment. It was expected that use of online services would occur mainly in the 1983 groups, since online database searching was not offered in the Woodruff Library before 1978. The response to this question becomes more interesting when contrasted with the current use of online services as measured in the next section of the survey.

Most of the conclusions on use of library materials by these groups when they were students were influenced by the time factor, students' recollections, and the possible differences in teaching methodology between 1977 and 1983. Aside from those three points there was, however, a real trend in both the

increased usage of periodical material and the use of online services by students in the program in recent years.

The final part of the survey instrument asked about current use of libraries, focusing on both the type of library utilized (academic, public, or corporate) and the use of materials relevant to the position held by the individual. There are striking differences based on both time (1977 and 1983) and on type of student surveyed (EMBA and MBA).

The most significant differences between more and less recent graduates emerged when they were asked about their continued use of the Woodruff Library at Emory University after graduation. Twice as many of the 1983 graduates continue to use the Woodruff library as do the 1977 grads. It is theorized here that the earlier graduates were not as confident about their reception at the library as were the most recent graduates who personally knew the business librarians from bibliographic instruction sessions and reference assistance provided to them as students. The difference persists between EMBA's and MBA's, with MBA's using the academic library more than EMBA's, but it is a less significant difference than that which occurred between the 1977 and 1983 groups.

When asked how many use their public libraries for business materials, the difference between the MBA's of 1977 and 1983 was opposite to the previous question. Twice as many 1977 graduates used the public library for business materials as did members of the class of 1983. The EMBA's use of their public library made the difference between the 1977 and 1983 groups even more significant since they were only part of the more current group.

Almost 90% of them used their public library for business materials. When they were excluded from the 1983 class, and only MBA's were observed, the class of 1977 used its public library three times as much as the class of 1983. A partial reason for this factor may be the latter class's use of the Woodruff Library.

The survey question on the availability of a library in the firm where the graduate was employed may explain why the earlier class used public libraries more often. Although about as many 1977 graduates as 1983 graduates have firm libraries in which they have access to business material, the situation is not comparable when looking at the EMBA's versus the MBA's. The firms in which the 1983 MBA's work are twice as likely to have libraries than the firms in which the EMBA's work. This may be attributable in part to the fact that a higher percent of the EMBA's work in manufacturing firms. There is probably less likelihood of libraries in such firms than in financial institutions because of the nature of the work and the amount of information in print form needed by the latter as opposed to the former.

In answering the question about current use of online services, all of the groups were almost the same. Approximately a quarter of those answering the questionnaire wrote that they used online services now. This means that members of the class of 1977 have acquired the use of online services in their work environments, while an almost equal number from the class of 1983 have stopped using online services since they were students. There appears to be a need for greater education about the use of

online services as a reference tool. A few more of the 1977 graduates used online services than did the 1983 grads (38.5% versus 26.2%). The EMBA's seem to have developed a taste for online searching in their student days and appear to continue to use it when at their jobs. This may be because they never stopped working while going to school, so it was more natural for them to transfer applicability and use of online searching to an existing environment while learning the technique.

Respondents were asked about their current reading of periodical literature in the field of business. As stated earlier, this question was really asked in order to compile a list of books which were reviewed in the journals mentioned, determine how many of the book reviewed were selected for inclusion in the library collection, and, finally, ascertain how many of the books reviewed and owned were being read. (As an aside, the journals most frequently mentioned were not, at the time, used as selection aids). The most highly cited serials were The Wall Street Journal, Business Week and Forbes. In a close second were Fortune, and Harvard Business Review. The overwhelming choice, for all groups, however, was the Wall Street Journal. This was true for the 1977 and 1983 MBA groups as well as the EMBA group. The most highly cited journal after the Wall Street Journal for the 1977 group was a tie between Fortune and Forbes. In the 1983 group, the second most cited journal was Business Week and among the EMBA's it was the Harvard Business Review. The EMBA's also cited Time while the 1977 MBA's cited Management Accounting and Institutional Investor. The 1983 MBA group cited Money, Journal of Accounting, and Advertising Age.

Coming to conclusions about this wide diversity of professional reading, including contrasting scholarly with popular periodicals, would require additional research and data. The list of titles included in the survey included both scholarly and popular periodicals, but, for the most part, all graduates of the program, whether 1977 or 1983, and whether part-time EMBA's or full-time MBA's, seem to read popular periodicals.

Respondents were asked whether they shared periodicals with their colleagues; 53.8% of the 1977 graduates and 76.2% of the 1983 group answered affirmatively. That recent graduates are more likely to share reading material with colleagues than the earlier graduates may constitute a difference in the type of person going to business school, or it may be because members of the 1977 class are higher on the corporate ladder and more apt to value information as a privately-held commodity.

A question about loose-leaf business services also showed a striking difference between the two time periods rather than between the type or age of the student. By far, the earlier group, 1977 graduates, used loose-leaf services more than the latter group, whether the latter group included its EMBA's or not. Almost 50% of the 1977 group used loose-leaf services in their jobs, while only 16% of the 1983 graduates did. When the EMBA's were taken out of the group, only 14% used loose leaf services. Perhaps non loose-leaf users are getting the information provided from these services in some other format. One possible theory is that, since the 1983 MBA's are more apt to have access to a firm library, the librarian is using both loose-leaf and online services, and the graduates themselves have

no need to use loose-leaf services.

A final question was included to determine how many business school graduates read books in their fields of expertise after graduating from school. A resounding 76.9% of the 1977 graduates and 73.8% of the 1983 graduates continue to read books in their fields. They read exactly what the general public is reading, best seller-type material including Lee Iaccoca's autobiography, the One-Minute Manager, and other popular business self-help type material.

The conclusions that can be drawn from this survey are that there are three types of differences noted in the groups. In addition to the differences traceable to time periods (1977 vs. 1983) and types of student (MBA vs. EMBA), the major difference tended to be the variations in the types of libraries and services used by the groups.

CONCLUSION

The selection of materials and the evaluation of the collection that is subsequently formed from those materials are among the more difficult variables for librarians to measure. Little is known about selection from a research perspective, and even less work has been done to determine what makes "good" selection decisions different from "bad" selection decisions. Most aspects of the selection component in the collection development process are highly subjective and cannot be quantified easily, if at all. They tend therefore to be processes which are difficult to judge in terms of value.

The process of evaluating a collection once selection has taken place is also fraught with problems. The two standard methodologies for evaluation purposes, quantitative and qualitative, are not pure in the field of collection evaluation. There are no strictly objective methods for assessing the value of the collection in terms of the community it serves since the community is always changing. Does a librarian evaluate the collection in terms of the community existing at the time it was purchased, or does a librarian evaluate the collection in terms of the community using it at the time of the evaluation? Nor are there any easy objective methods for determining the value of a particular item purchased in comparison with the other items available at the time of selection which were not purchased.

Few purely quantitative methods are based on absolutes. If circulation records are checked to determine the "popularity" of an item and it hasn't circulated very much, how can it be

determined whether an item not selected would have circulated more often? The evaluation methods used to determine the value of a collection only indicate problem areas: rarely do they confirm areas of strength. Therefore, most collection development activities are subjective in nature, from the selection of one item over another to the evaluation of part of a collection.

Very little has been written about the process of collection development in terms of different disciplines, fields and subjects. A few books, notably Landscape of Literatures by Paul Metz, have attempted to define what one university library has done in the process of developing a series of subject collections. Since this was written with a specific community and a specific point in time delineated, it is hard to make any generalizations from the study. A method for determining what a a specific collection for a specific library should look like can be projected from Metz' book. It is still important for each library to do its own evaluation, and this process should be, for the most part, based on the comparison of a number of collections and not just on an in-depth look at one. The RLG conspectus is trying to quantify data from the largest research libraries in order to come to some evaluative conclusions, yet the results of the conspectus do not seem to be transferrable to even other RLG members who did not participate in the conspectus, much less to those libraries in academia outside the RLG group. Any conclusions drawn from evaluation studies tend to be specific to one location rather than applicable to all such collections in general.

When attempting to find writings on collection development for a professional collection, the researchers were hampered by a number of factors. Collection development as a subject area is badly organized in most indexes and abstracts in our field. Citations are scattered under numerous headings, including "selection", "evaluation of material", and the like. Very little research or specific writing has been done on the methodology of teaching and behavioral objectives in the classroom concerning professional as opposed to academic education. Even less has been written on the collections that are developed for the different kinds of education needed in those classrooms. The researchers believe this study is one of the first, if not the first, to deal specifically with professional business collections and their development and evaluation. The results of this study are tentative and should be regarded as a first step in what is hoped will be a long line of research studies built on the premise that professional education requires different collections than does academic education.

The first area to be examined in this study was the evaluation of the collection in terms of a "model" collection. In this regard, the researchers used the Baker Library collection at Harvard in those areas in which Emory University was the strongest, so that the collections might be expected to resemble each other more closely. The resemblance weakened during the study period and there was a decline in the mutual holdings of the two collections. The growing dissimilarity is a reality but the reasons behind this growth are far more difficult to ascertain.

Is it better for the Emory University collection to be different than the Harvard collection or does similarity breed value? In the list-checking method, it has always been assumed that one picks a superior collection to compare with one's own collection; and the more closely one's collection resembles the model, the better one's collection is. What the researchers have uncovered is a paradox. While the method of selection of material for the business collection at Emory University changed from 1977 to 1983, the match of the collection to the one at Harvard declined. Although the percentage of decline was not significant, there still was a difference in the two years studied. This change leads to one of two conclusions: either the method of selection in 1977 was better than that in 1983 or wanting to be like Harvard University is not a valid assumption. The selection methods of 1977 were relatively haphazard and not a particularly professional effort on the part of the library or the business school. Therefore, if the first conclusion is accepted, the utilization of approval plans and subject specialists within the library have not provided a "better" collection than that which could be assembled by single orders generated by faculty members. The researchers tend to favor the second conclusion, which suggests that a strong similarity to the Harvard collection is not necessarily an appropriate target. The reason for discarding the first conclusion is the discovery that items appearing on the 1983 lists circulated more frequently on an annual basis than items from 1977 lists. This supports the conclusion that patrons were more satisfied with those items selected in 1983 than they were with those selected in 1977. The

next possible area for research could be a study of student attitudes about the library's collection and services.

Another conclusion drawn from the study is that the reading interests of students and graduates of a professional education program are more practical or work-oriented, and less academic or scholarly. This conclusion is based upon the fact that for 1977 and 1983 a greater percentage of books with reviews appearing in professional literature circulated than did books appearing on the Baker list. When surveyed about journals they read as students or business practitioners, the respondents most often cited the professional, popular serials and very rarely included academic, research journals on their lists. These results support an initial assumption by the authors which presumed the need for a dichotomous library collection -- containing the traditional academic material and the contemporary practical literature of the profession. Further study could try to determine the ideal blend between these two different collection components.

The researchers also conclude that professional business education, and therefore business collection development, might be better served with more emphasis on the value of information and how to obtain it, since a majority of the students were entering areas of the business community in which information was the commodity traded, much as a raw material would be traded in the manufacturing sector. Many students turned to libraries after graduation, but they tended to use their public library as much as an academic library, probably reflecting the fact that scholarly material is not valued as much in the field as it is in

academia. The interest in professional, practical information shows a distinct need for students to be introduced to the "real life" materials while in school, and not just to academic materials.

Finally, an interesting further study could be conducted to determine the influence that bibliographic instruction might have on the use of technological advances once the student was out in the business world. A control group situation could be easily mounted and some probing questions could be asked in a long-range study of the habits of business people based on what they learned at college. The researchers found the community surveyed particularly helpful and eager to engage in survey questions. Follow-up interviews might be a possibility with this group.

APPENDIX A

TITLES INCLUDED IN

NEW BOOKS IN BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

AND

ACQUIRED BY EMORY UNIVERSITY

1977

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF TITLES ON BIBLIOGRAPHY	NUMBER OF TITLES ACQUIRED BY EMORY
Accounting and Control	87	41/47.126%
Corporate and Business Finance	55	22/40%
Economic and Social Conditions of the United States	81	48/59.259%
Financial Institutions and Capital Markets	166	67/40.36%
International Business	99	45/45.454%
Management	203	75/36.946%
Marketing	117	54/46.154%
Organizational Behavior	25	4/16%
Personnel	193	82/42.49%
Production Management	20	4/20%
TOTAL	1046	442/42.26%

APPENDIX B

TITLES INCLUDED IN

RECENT ADDITIONS TO BAKER LIBRARY

AND

ACQUIRED BY EMORY UNIVERSITY

1983

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF TITLES ON BIBLIOGRAPHY	NUMBER OF TITLES ACQUIRED BY EMORY
Accounting and Control	89	31/34.83%
Finance	392	129/32.91%
Human Resource Management	278	81/29.14%
International Business	169	77/45.56%
Management	292	101/34.59%
Marketing	138	61/44.2%
Production and Operations	128	38/29.69%
United States Economic and Social Conditions	177	92/51.98%
TOTAL	1663	610/36.68%

APPENDIX C

PROPORTION OF BUSINESS AND NON-BUSINESS BOOK

REVIEWS IN FIVE SELECTED SERIALS, 1977 AND 1983

1977

SERIAL	NUMBER OF BOOK REVIEWS	BUSINESS BOOK REVIEWS	NON-BUSINESS BOOK REVIEWS
Barron's	55	35/63.8%	20/36.4%
Business Week	88	20/22.7%	68/77.4%
Fortune	11	4/36.4%	7/63.6%
Harvard Business Review	77	77/100%	0
Wall Street Journal	193	37/19.2%	156/80.8%
TOTAL	424	173/40.8%	251/59.2%

1983

SERIAL	NUMBER OF BOOK REVIEWS	BUSINESS BOOK REVIEWS	NON-BUSINESS BOOK REVIEWS
Barron's	44	34/77.3%	10/22.7%
Business Week	85	18/21.2%	67/78.8%
Fortune	26	13/50%	13/50%
Harvard Business Review	58	54/93.1%	4/6.9%
Wall Street Journal	210	29/13.8%	181/86.2%
TOTAL	423	148/35%	275/65%

APPENDIX D

PROPORTION OF BUSINESS BOOKS REVIEWED IN FIVE SELECTED SERIALS, 1977 AND 1983 AND OWNED BY EMORY UNIVERSITY

1977

SERIAL	BUSINESS BOOK REVIEWS	OWNED BY EMORY
Barron's	35	22/62.9%
Business Week	20	18/90%
Fortune	4	3/75%
Harvard Business Review	77	41/53.2%
Wall Street Journal	37	25/67.6%
TOTAL	173	109/63%

1983

SERIAL	BUSINESS BOOK REVIEWS	OWNED BY EMORY
Barron's	34	18/52.9%
Business Week	18	14/77.8%
Fortune	13	12/92.3%
Harvard Business Review	54	41/75.9%
Wall Street Journal	29	20/69%
TOTAL	148	105/70.9%

APPENDIX E

PROPORTION OF BUSINESS AND NON-BUSINESS BOOKS RECEIVING MULTIPLE REVIEWS IN FIVE SELECTED SERIALS, 1977 AND 1983

1977

NUMBER OF REVIEWS	BOOKS RECEIVING MULTIPLE REVIEWS	BUSINESS BOOKS REVIEWED	NON-BUSINESS BOOKS REVIEWED
2	45	27/60%	18/40%
3	2	1/50%	1/50%
4	3	3/100%	0
5	0		
TOTAL	50	31/62%	19/38%

1983

NUMBER OF REVIEWS	BOOKS RECEIVING MULTIPLE REVIEWS	BUSINESS BOOKS REVIEWED	NON-BUSINESS BOOKS REVIEWED
2	27	14/51.9%	13/48.1%
3	2	1/50%	1/50%
4	4	4/100%	0
5	0		
TOTAL	33	19/57.6%	14/42.4%

APPENDIX F

ACQUISITION OF BUSINESS BOOKS RECEIVING MULTIPLE REVIEWS IN FIVE SELECTED SERIALS, 1977 AND 1983

1977

NUMBER OF REVIEWS	BUSINESS BOOKS RECEIVING MULTIPLE REVIEWS	BUSINESS BOOKS RECEIVING MULTIPLE REVIEWS OWNED BY EMORY
2	27	19/70%
3	1	1/100%
4	3	3/100%
TOTAL	31	23/74.2%

1983

NUMBER OF REVIEWS	BUSINESS BOOKS RECEIVING MULTIPLE REVIEWS	BUSINESS BOOKS RECEIVING MULTIPLE REVIEWS OWNED BY EMORY
2	14	12/85.7%
3	1	1/100%
4	4	3/75%
TOTAL	19	16/84.2%

APPENDIX G

ACQUISITION OF BUSINESS AND NON-BUSINESS BOOKS

REVIEWED IN FIVE SELECTED SERIALS, 1977 AND 1983

1977

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF BOOKS REVIEWED	NUMBER OF TITLES ACQUIRED
Business	173	109/63%
Non-Business	232	151/65.1%

1983

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF BOOKS REVIEWED	NUMBER OF TITLES ACQUIRED
Business	148	105/70.9%
Non-Business	261	186/71.3%

APPENDIX H

NON-BUSINESS BOOKS REVIEWED IN 1977

	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SUBJECT AREAS	BOOKS REVIEWED	ACQUIRED BY EMORY
AG	Dictionaries and other general reference works	2	1
B	Philosophy, general	2	2
BF	Psychology	4	4
BP	Islam, Bahaism, Theosophy, etc.	1	1
CB	History of civilization	1	1
CS	Genealogy	1	1
CT	Biography	2	1
D	History, general	8	6
DD	History, Germany	1	1
DG	History, Italy	1	1
DK	History, Russia, Poland, Finland	1	1
DR	History, Eastern Europe, Balkan Peninsula, Turkey	1	1
DS	History, Asia	8	7
DT	History, Africa	3	3
E	History, United States	11	9
F	History, Americas, non-United States	6	4
G	Geography, general	4	2
GR	Folklore	2	1
GV	Recreation	16	5
HC	Economic history and conditions of national production	3	3
HM	Sociology	1	1
HN	Social history, social problems, social reform	1	1
HQ	The family, marriage, woman	1	1
HV	Social pathology, social and public welfare, criminology	11	5
HX	Socialism, communism, anarchism	1	1
JC	Political theory, theory of the state	1	1
JK	Political science, United States	7	4
JS	Local government	1	0
JX	International law, international relations	1	0
K	Law of the United States	7	7
L	Education, general	1	1
ML	Literature of music	1	1
N	Visual arts, general	4	1
NA	Architecture	3	3
NC	Drawing, design, illustration	2	0
PE	English philology and language	2	2
PG	Slavic, Baltic, Albanian language and literatures	3	3
PL	Eastern Asia, Africa, Oceania language and literatures	2	1
PN	Literary history and collections	9	6
PQ	Romance literatures	3	2
PR	English literature	23	15
PS	American literature	39	18
PT	Germanic literatures	1	1
QB	Astronomy	5	5
QC	Physics	2	2
QH	Natural history, general	3	3
QL	Zoology	3	1
RA	Public aspects of medicine	1	1

APPENDIX H (cont.)

	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SUBJECT AREAS	BOOKS REVIEWED	ACQUIRED BY EMORY
RC	Internal medicine, practice of medicine	1	1
RD	Surgery	1	1
SF	Animal culture	2	2
TF	Railroad engineering and operation	1	1
TK	Electrical engineering, electronics, nuclear engineering	1	0
TL	Motor vehicles, aeronautics, astronautics	4	1
TP	Chemical technology	1	0
TR	Photography	1	0
VK	Navigation, merchant marine	1	1
Z	Books, bibliography	2	2
	TOTAL	232	151/65.1%

APPENDIX I

NON-BUSINESS BOOKS REVIEWED IN 1983

	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SUBJECT AREAS	BOOKS REVIEWED	ACQUIRED BY EMORY
B	Philosophy, general	1	0
BF	Psychology	3	1
BJ	Ethics	1	1
BP	Islam, Bahaism, Theosophy, etc.	1	1
BX	Denominations and sects	1	1
CB	History of civilization	1	1
CS	Genealogy	1	1
CT	Biography	1	1
D	History, general	5	4
DA	History, Great Britain	4	3
DK	History, Russia, Poland, Finland	7	5
DS	History, Asia	16	16
DT	History, Africa	2	2
E	History, United States	39	35
F	History, Americas, non-United States	7	6
G	Geography, general	2	2
GA	Mathematical geography, cartography	1	0
GN	Anthropology	2	2
GV	Recreation	8	2
HE	Transportation and communication	1	1
HN	Social history, social problems, social reform	3	2
HQ	The family, marriage, woman	7	7
HV	Social pathology, social and public welfare, criminology	4	3
HX	Socialism, communism, anarchism	1	0
JC	Political theory, theory of the state	3	1
JK	Political science, United States	2	2
JX	International law, international relations	3	3
K	Law, general	1	0
KF	Law of the United States	3	2
LA	History of education	4	4
LB	Theory and practice of education	1	1
ML	Literature of music	8	5
NA	Architecture	2	1
NC	Drawing design, illustration	3	2
ND	Painting	1	1
NK	Decorative arts, applied arts, decoration and ornament	1	0
PE	English philology and language	1	1
PJ	Oriental languages and literature	1	1
PL	Eastern Asia, Africa, Oceania languages and literatures	1	1
PN	Literary history and collections	13	6
PQ	Romance literatures	3	3
PR	English literature	19	9
PS	American literature	38	28
PT	Germanic literatures	2	1
Q	Science, general	2	2
QA	Mathematics	1	1
QE	Geology	1	1
QH	Natural history, general	1	0
QL	Zoology	1	1

APPENDIX I (cont.)

	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SUBJECT AREAS	BOOKS REVIEWED	ACQUIRED BY EMORY
QM	Human anatomy	1	0
R	Medicine, general	2	1
RC	Internal medicine, practice of medicine	2	1
RD	Surgery	2	0
T	Technology, general	2	1
TA	Engineering, general; civil engineering, general	1	0
TK	Electrical engineering, electronics, nuclear engineering	1	0
TS	Manufactures	1	1
TX	Home economics	1	0
U	Military science, general	3	2
UA	Armies	2	2
UB	Military administration	2	1
UF	Artillery	1	1
UG	Military engineering	2	1
VA	Navies	1	1
Z	Books, bibliography	2	0
	TOTAL	261	186/71.3%

APPENDIX J

June 10, 1985

Dear Business School Graduate:

We are attempting to measure the effectiveness of the business collection in the Woodruff Library at Emory University. One element in our study is the use of the library collection by business students. We are seeking information on which library resources were used by students and which library resources are used by business professionals.

We have selected the MBA graduates of 1977 and the MBA and EMBA graduates of 1983 as our test group and would appreciate your taking the time to complete the following questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed, self-addressed stamped envelope.

We are hoping that the responses will suggest methods of improving the materials and services offered by the Woodruff Library to the students and alumni of the Business School.

Thank you for your assistance.

David L. Vidor Elizabeth Futas

David Vidor Elizabeth Futas
Researchers

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Is the firm where you are currently employed in the profit sector?

yes _____ no _____

2. To which category does your firm belong?

_____manufacturing
_____services
_____transporation
_____financial
_____public utility
_____other

specify_____

3. What one word best describes your function? (e.g. PR, investments counselor, actuary, accountant, etc.)

_____

Over for questionnaire --->

BUSINESS MATERIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I

1. As a business school student, why did you use the library? Check only the most applicable answer:

   Class assignments: Reading_____
   Class assignments: Written_____
   Case Studies _____
   Work related _____
   Job placement activities _____
   Other _____ please specify what:_____
   _____

2. Which did you use most?

   Books _____
   Magazines _____
   Newspapers _____

3. Of the magazines that you used a student, please check off all of those you now remember using frequently:

   Academy of Management Journal _____
   Administrative Science Quarterly _____
   Barron's _____
   Business Week _____
   Forbes _____
   Fortune _____
   Harvard Business Review _____
   Journal of Business _____
   Journal of Finance _____
   Journal of Financial Economics _____
   Journal of Marketing _____
   Journal of Marketing Research _____
   Journal of Monetary Economics _____
   Lloyds Bank Review _____
   Others (be specific)

   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

4. Did you ever avail yourself, while a student, with any of the online services available through the library?

   _____yes _____no

Part II

5. Have you continued to use the Woodruff Library as an alumnus/ alumna of the school?

_____yes _____no

a) How often do you use Woodruff Library _____

b) Do you use it to keep up with your field_____

c) Do you perform research for the company_____

6. Do you have access to a library in the firm where you presently work?

_____yes _____no

a) How often do you use your firm's library _____

b) Do you use it to keep up with your field_____

c) Do you perform research for the company in your firm's library _____

7. Do you ever use a public library for business materials?

_____yes _____no

If so, which library?

a) How often do you use the public library_____

b) Do you use it to keep up with your field_____

c) Do you perform research for the company at the public library_____

8. Do you use any online business services? _____yes _____no

If so, which ones? (e.g. NEXUS, DIALOG, Management ASAP,etc.)

_____

a) Do you get them yourself _____

b) Do you use your firm's library _____

c) Do you use a public library _____

d) Do you use another academic library _____
If so, which one?

_____

9. Do you read regularly any of the following business magazines and newspapers? (Please check all applicable answers):

	own copy	rec'd from c'league	read at Emory	read at pub lib	read at Corp.
Academy of Management Journal	____	____	____	____	____
Administrative Science Quarterly	____	____	____	____	____
Barron's	____	____	____	____	____
Business Week	____	____	____	____	____
Forbes	____	____	____	____	____
Fortune	____	____	____	____	____
Harvard Business Review	____	____	____	____	____
Journal of Business	____	____	____	____	____
Journal of Finance	____	____	____	____	____
Journal of Financial Economics	____	____	____	____	____
Journal of Marketing	____	____	____	____	____
Journal of Marketing Research	____	____	____	____	____
Journal of Monetary Economics	____	____	____	____	____
Lloyds Bank Review	____	____	____	____	____
New York Times	____	____	____	____	____
Wall Street Journal	____	____	____	____	____
Other					
_____	____	____	____	____	____
_____	____	____	____	____	____
_____	____	____	____	____	____
_____	____	____	____	____	____

10. Do you share periodical titles with colleagues when you are through with them?

_____yes _____no

11. Do you use any business looseleaf services?

_____yes _____no

a) Do you get them yourself _____
b) Do you use your firm's library _____
c) Do you use a public library _____
d) Do you use Woodruff Library at Emory _____
e) Do you use another academic library _____
If so, which one?

_____

12. Have you read any books in the business field since you have been out of school?

_____yes _____no

Can you remember the last "business book" that you read and how you found out about it?

Thank you for your help. Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed, stamped, envelope as soon as possible, at the latest by July 1, 1985.

WORKS CONSULTED

Bowker Annual of Library & Book Trade Information. 30th edition. New York: Bowker, 1985.

Brittain, J. Michael. Information and Its Users. Bath: Bath University Press, 1970.

Emory: School of Business Administration, Graduate Program, 1982/1983. Atlanta: Emory University, 1982.

Emory University (Bulletin): School of Business Administration 1977-79. Atlanta: Emory University, 1977.

Emory University Commencement. Atlanta: Emory University, 1977.

Emory University Commencement. Atlanta: Emory University, 1983.

"Employment: Recovery and Change." Fortune 8 August 1983: 17-18.

Fischgrund, Tom. The Insider's Guide to the Top Ten Business Schools. Boston: Little Brown, 1983.

Master in Business Administration. Boston: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration, (1977?)

MBA Program. Boston: Harvard Business School, 1983.

Metz, Paul. The Landscape of Literature. Chicago: American Library Association, 1983.

New Books in Business and Economics: Recent Additions to Baker Library January - December 1977.

Recent Additions to Baker Library January - December 1983.